

08 JUN 2007



UNITED STATES PATENT and TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Stephen E. Arnett
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

In re Application of	:	DECISION ON
Rivet et al	:	
PCT No.: PCT/US04/01845	:	
Application No: 10/553,611	:	PETITION UNDER
Int. Filing Date: 23 January 2004	:	
Priority Date: 25 January 2005	:	
Attorney's Docket No.: 67065-037 (PEPL-0112)	:	37 CFR 1.47(a)
For: MICROPAYMENT PROCESSING	:	
METHOD AND SYSTEM	:	

This is in response to the "PETITION UNDER 37 CFR 37 C.F.R. 1.47(A)" filed on 26 February 2007. The petition fee is now \$200.00 for a petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) so the check of \$130.00 is insufficient to cover the petition fee.

BACKGROUND

In a decision from this Office on 16 June 2006, the petition to revive aforementioned application was granted.

On 24 July 2006, the United States Designated/Elected Office (DO/EO/US) mailed a "NOTIFICATION OF MISSING REQUIREMENTS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 371 IN THE UNITED STATES DESIGNATED/ELECTED OFFICE (DO/EO/US)" (Form PCT/DO/EO/905) which informed applicant, inter alia, that an "Oath or Declaration of the inventors, in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497(a), and (b), identifying the application by International application number and international filing date" must be submitted within two months from the date of this Notice or by 32 months from the priority date, whichever is later, in order to avoid abandonment of the national stage application.

On 26 February 2007, petitioner filed the present petition, a declaration in support of filing on behalf of omitted inventors Prasad Jonnalagadda, Perry Solomon and Robert Carney accompanied, inter alia, an executed Declaration without their signatures.

DISCUSSION

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) must be accompanied by (1) the fee under 37 CFR 1.17(g), (2) factual proof that the missing joint inventor refuses to execute the application or cannot be reached after diligent effort, (3) a statement of the last known address of the missing inventor, and (4) an oath or declaration by each 37 CFR 1.47(a) applicant on his or her own behalf and on behalf of the non-signing joint inventor.

Furthermore, section 409.03(d) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.) **Proof of Unavailability or Refusal**, the relevant sections states, in part:

REFUSAL TO JOIN:

A refusal by an inventor to sign an oath or declaration when the inventor has not been presented with the application papers does not itself suggest that the inventor is refusing to join the application unless it is clear that the inventor understands exactly what he or she is being asked to sign and refuses to accept the application papers. A copy of the application papers should be sent to the last known address of the nonsigning inventor, or, if the nonsigning inventor is represented by counsel, to the address of the nonsigning inventor's attorney. The fact that an application may contain proprietary information does not relieve the **37 CFR 1.47** applicant of the responsibility to present the application papers to the inventor if the inventor is willing to receive the papers in order to sign the oath or declaration. It is noted that the inventor may obtain a complete copy of the application, unless the inventor has assigned his or her interest in the application, and the assignee has requested that the inventor not be permitted access. See **MPEP § 106**. It is reasonable to require that the inventor be presented with the application papers before a petition under **37 CFR 1.47** is granted since such a procedure ensures that the inventor is apprised of the application to which the oath or declaration is directed. *In re Gray*, 115 USPQ 80 (Comm'r Pat. 1956).

Where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of the presentation of the application papers and of the refusal must be specified in a statement of facts by the person who presented the inventor with the application papers and/or to whom the refusal was made. Statements by a party not present when an oral refusal is made will not be accepted.

Proof that a *bona fide* attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the nonsigning inventor for signature, but the inventor refused to accept delivery of the papers or expressly stated that the application papers should not be sent, may be sufficient. When there is an

express oral refusal, that fact along with the time and place of the refusal must be stated in the statement of facts. When there is an express written refusal, a copy of the document evidencing that refusal must be made part of the statement of facts. The document may be redacted to remove material not related to the inventor's reasons for refusal.

When it is concluded by the **37 CFR 1.47** applicant that a nonsigning inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which that conclusion is based should be stated in the statement of facts in support of the petition or directly in the petition. If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the petition or in any statement of facts, such evidence should be submitted. Whenever a nonsigning inventor gives a reason for refusing to sign the application oath or declaration, that reason should be stated in the petition.

Petitioner has not satisfied items (1) - (4) of 37 CFR 1.47(a).

Regarding item (1), petitioner has not provided the complete fee of \$200.00 under 37 CFR 1.17(g).

Regarding item (2), it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that a copy of the application papers were presented to the nonsigning inventors Prasad Jonnalagadda, Perry Solomon and Robert Carney. Petitioner asserts that the documents were e-mailed to them by Mr. Nix. The documents forwarded to them, however, did not appear to include a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) as required under MPEP 409.03(d) because only two documents (declaration and assignment) were sent to them as indicated by Mr. Nix.

Regarding item (3), petitioner has provided a statement of the last known address of the missing inventors but it is unclear why the addresses of nonsigning inventors Prasad Jonnalagadda and Perry Solomon differ from the addresses stated in the declaration.

Regarding item (4), it is unclear if the signing inventors are Ronald L. Rivest, Silvio Micali, Joseph Bergeron III and Mark Bates are signing on their behalf and on the behalf of the nonsigning inventors. A statement that they are signing the declaration on behalf of the nonsigning inventors is required. SEE MPEP 602.

Consequently, the petition has not met the requirements under 37 CFR 1.47(a).

CONCLUSION

The petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

If reconsideration of the merits of the petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) is desired, applicant must file a request for reconsideration within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mail date of this Decision. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)." Extensions of time are available under 37 CFR 1.136(a). Failure to timely file the proper response will result in ABANDONMENT.

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed to the Mail Stop PCT, Commissioner for Patents, Office of PCT Legal Administration, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention of the Office of PCT Legal Administration.



Rafael Bacares

PCT Legal Examiner

PCT Legal Office

Telephone: (571) 272-3276

Facsimile: (571) 273-0459